

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GENERAL EMPLOYEES TRUST FUND  
and BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF GENERAL  
EMPLOYEES TRUST FUND,

No. C 09-02722 WHA

Plaintiffs,

v.

EAST BAY BUILDING SERVICES, a  
partnership, ABDULLAH HOMRAN,  
individually and as a partner in EAST BAY  
BUILDING SERVICES, and NABILA  
HOMRAN, individually and as a partner in  
EAST BAY BUILDING SERVICES,

**ORDER DENYING MOTION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Defendants.

In this ERISA action, plaintiffs General Employees Trust Fund and Board of Trustees of General Employees Trust Fund were granted partial summary judgment against defendant East Bay Building Services, Abdullah Homran and Nabila Homran. Defendants, who are proceeding *pro se*, have now filed a motion for reconsideration of that order. Civil Local Rule 7-9(b) provides that a party moving for reconsideration must show:

(1) That at the time of a motion for leave [to file a motion for reconsideration], a material difference in fact or law exists from that which was presented to the Court before entry of the interlocutory order for which reconsideration is sought. The party also must show that in the exercise of reasonable diligence the party applying for reconsideration did not know such fact or law at the time of the interlocutory order; or


(2) The emergence of new material facts or a change of law occurring after the time of such order; or

(3) A manifest failure by the Court to consider material facts or dispositive legal arguments which were presented to the Court before such interlocutory order.

Defendants have not shown any of the above. Their motion merely repeats almost verbatim statements from their amended answer to the complaint (Dkt. No. 6). Their motion for reconsideration is therefore **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: April 29, 2010.



---

WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE